

1
2 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
3 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

4 LINDA LEE SIPPLE,
5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 ZIONS BANCORPORATION, N.A.,
8 Defendant.
9

Case No. 2:21-cv-00904-GMN-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 8]

10 Pending before the Court is a stipulation for extension of time for Defendant to respond to
11 Plaintiff's complaint. Docket No. 8. The parties ask the Court to permit Defendant to file a
12 response to Plaintiff's complaint twenty-one days after the Court issues a ruling on a motion to
13 remand that Plaintiff may or may not file. *Id.* at 2. The parties submit that granting the instant
14 request will conserve party and judicial resources. *Id.*

15 Whether Plaintiff will file a motion to remand is uncertain, as the parties merely submit
16 that Plaintiff "may seek to remand this matter." *Id.* Further, the parties fail to explain how granting
17 the instant stipulation, which would effectively stay discovery proceedings whether or not Plaintiff
18 files a motion to remand, would conserve party resources. "[E]ven if the motion to remand is
19 granted, 'that will not render any discovery conducted moot or otherwise result in a waste of the
20 parties' resources.'" *Anoruo v. Valley Health Sys.*, 2018 WL 1785866, at *3 (D. Nev. Apr. 13,
21 2018) (quoting *Cooks-Putnam v. Trump Las Vegas Corp.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 115606, at *3 (D.
22 Nev. Aug. 31, 2015)); *see also Turner Broad. Sys., Inc. v. Tracinda Corp.*, 175 F.R.D. 554, 556
23 (D. Nev. 1997) (stating discovery should proceed absent a "strong showing" to the contrary).

24 Accordingly, the parties' stipulation, Docket No. 8, is hereby **DENIED**.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: June 4, 2021

27
28 
Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge